

Attorney Docket No. 42929.0200

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action dated June 13, 2003, Applicants have amended particular claims to more clearly define embodiments consistent with the present invention. Claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 14-17, 19, 22, 23, 25, 30, 31, 36-39, 41, and 44 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 13-16, 23-26, 29-33, 35-38, 45-48, 51-55, and 57-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,226,618 (Downs patent). Claims 45-48, 51-55, and 57-60 have been canceled. Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 23 to recite that the various verification steps or elements occur during the user's on-line session, meaning that they occur essentially in real-time or near real-time.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Downs patent does not disclose determining if an order identifier is valid, active, and non-suppressed during a user's on-line session. For an order identifier to be active, a corresponding order must not have been canceled before download of a file during the on-line session. For an order identifier to be non-suppressed, the order must not have been canceled after download of the file during the on-line session. The claimed invention thus essentially performs security checks in real-time or near real-time while the user is on-line and executing a transaction.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Downs patent does not disclose at least use of the security checks during the user's on-line session, as illustrated in steps 121-148 on columns 18-19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 23, and 45 are patentable over the Downs patent.

Attorney Docket No. 42929.0200

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-4, 7-11, 13-16, 24-26, 29-33, and 35-38 are patentable for at least the reasons as provided above for their respective base claims.

Claims 6, 12, 17-18, 20-21, 28, 34, 39-40, 42-43, 50, 56, 61-62, and 64-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as having been obvious over the Downs patent and Official Notice. Claims 50, 56, 61-62, and 64-65 have been canceled. Applicants have amended independent claims 17 and 39 to recite automatically converting an identifier, along with the combination of other claimed elements. Although it may have been obvious to simply rename a file so that the name relates to its contents, Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to have a machine automatically perform this renaming. In the prior art, a user must review a file to determine its content and then manually rename the file. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that, even in light of the Official Notice, claims 17 and 39 are now patentable over the prior art.

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 6, 12, 18, 20-21, 28, 34, 40, 42-43 are patentable for at least the reasons as provided above for their respective base claims.

Claims 19, 22, 41, 44, 63, and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as having been obvious over the Downs patent and U.S. Patent No. 6,263,353. Claims 63 and 66 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 19, 22, 41, 44 are patentable for at least the reasons as provided above for their respective base claims.

Attorney Docket No. 42929.0200

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request
reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 13, 2003

By: Lance Vietzke
Lance L. Vietzke, Reg. No. 36,708
Snell & Wilmer, LLP
One Arizona Center
400 East Van Buren
Phoenix, AZ 85004-0001
(303) 634-2017
(303) 624-2020 (FAX)
lvietzke@swlaw.com

VIETZKL.DEN\55570.1